MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 444 UD 016 801

AUTHOR Baratta, Anthony N.
TITLE Skills Remediation in Reading for Optional Assignment Pupils; School Year 1974- 1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 23p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-59677

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Diagnostic Teaching; *High School Students; *Individual Instruction; *Reading Centers; *Reading Development; Reading Improvement; *Reading Skills; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Metropolitan Reading Test; *New York (New York); TOPS Program

ABSTRACT

This document presents a description and evaluation of the Skills Remediation in Reading for Optional Assignment Program (TOPS) conducted for 4,569 students in 27 high schools in New York City. The participants were Title I optional assignment students in grades 9 through 12, whose reading ability was a minimum of two years below grade level based on the Metropolitan Reading Tests. Students were selected by the guidance counselor in the participating high school. This program operated in 56 reading skills centers or labs. The 4,569 students were assigned to a daily period of reading instruction in addition to their regular English classes. The thrust of the program was that of individualized instruction using diagnostic prescriptive techniques in the reading skills lab. The evaluation consisted of a comparison between real post test and predicted post test scores as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in reading. Data were obtained from 81% of the students. Findings indicated that the students in this program progressed beyond their previous record of achievement in reading skills development. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137444

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-59677

SKILLS REMEDIATION IN READING FOR OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT PUPILS

School Year 1974-1975

Dr. Anthony N. Baratta

An evaluation of a New York City School District educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-1975 school year.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD016801

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
LIST OF TABLES		iii
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
	Selection of Students	1
	Program Treatment	1
	Program Implementation	1
	TOPS Program Organization and Administration	1
	Staff Activities	2
	Facilities	2
	Supplies and Equipment	2
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	4
	Evaluation Objective #1	4
	Evaluation Objective #2	4
	Evaluation Instruments for Objective #1	4
	Evaluation Instruments for Objective #2	4
	Dates of Pre and Posttesting	5
	Dates of Visits to Schools	5
	Data Loss	5
III.	FINDINGS	6
	Findings in context of evaluation objectives	6
	Findings of Evaluation Objective #1	6
	Findings of Evaluation Objective #2	7
	Statement of Discrepancy Analysis	11
	Servicing the Needs of the Specific Target Population	11
	Statement about Last Prior Evaluation Recommendations	11
	Reading Institutes and Conferences	11
IV.	SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12
	Summary of the major findings	12
	Conclusions	13
	Recommendations	14
V.	EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT	15
APPENDIX		
	TABLE 30A	16
	DATA LOSS FORM	17

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Analysis of Elements in TOPS Classes. 10

CHAPTER 1. THE PROGRAM

The Skills Remediation in Reading for Optional Assignment Program, (commonly referred to as TOPS), was conducted for 4569 students in 27 high schools from September 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975. Nineteen of the high schools began the program in the Fall Term and eight of the high schools instituted the program on February 1, 1975.

The staffing of the TOPS Program included one supervisor, one assistant coordinator, two teacher-trainers, 58 teachers, 58 paraprofessionals, and one school secretary.

Selection of Students. The subjects were Title 1 Optional Assignment students in grades 9-12, whose reading ability was a minimum of two years below grade level based on the Metropolitan Reading Tests. The subjects were selected by the guidance counselor in the participating high schools.

Program Treatment. As a result of participation in the TOPS Program, the reading grades of the subjects were to show a statistically significant difference between the real or actual posttest score and the predicted posttest score on the Metropolitan Reading Tests.

Program Implementation. The TOPS Program operated in 56 Reading Skills Centers (Labs). The Labs were equipped with abundant reading materials and equipment. The 4569 students were assigned to a daily period of reading instruction in addition to their regular English classes.

The thrust of the program was that of individualized instruction using diagnostic prescriptive techniques in the reading skills lab. Since the class size was limited to 15 students, they received optimum attention and instruction based on the analysis of their strengths and weaknesses in reading. As needed, the students were instructed in the mastery of word-attack skills, of phonetic and structural analysis, in the acquisition of vocabulary through context skills, in the various comprehension skills involved in getting and interpreting the meaning of the printed page, in the application of appropriate reading rates, and in the techniques of increasing reading rate. The students were encouraged to read extensively.

TOPS Program Organization and Administration. A highly organized and effective system was arranged for the operation and management of the reading skills labs. Mr. Leonard Kantrowitz, Supervisor, distributed checklists to each teacher specifying the various tasks to be performed in the program. These tasks were the setting-up of the reading

skills center, getting students acquainted with the routines, administering pre and post MAT tests, motivating students and administering diagnostic tests.

Staff Activities. The TOPS Program staff activities were organized along the lines of an instructional team model. Their various activities and duties are succinctly described in this section.

Supervisor. The supervisor was responsible for organizing and supervising all TOPS Program activities. Duties included training teachers in the program in the techniques of individualizing reading instruction, supervising the training of teachers and aides in the schools, observation in the schools, ordering supplies and materials, and preparing budgets and modifications.

One assistant coordinator. The assistant coordinator assisted in administering the program by carrying out the myriad details necessary for the day-to-day operation.

Two teacher-trainers. The teacher-trainers visited assigned schools on a regular basis to assist in training the classroom teachers in the techniques of individualizing instruction, student record keeping, and standardized test administration. They also served as disseminators of newer ideas in reading and assisted with dealing of various problems which occurred in the program.

Teachers. The 58 teachers set up the reading labs, diagnosed pupil strengths and weaknesses, planned remediation activities, administered reading tests, periodically assessed and modified the prescriptions of instruction, maintained accurate records of attendance of each student assigned to their classes, conducted individual and small group instruction, and trained and supervised the paraprofession.

Paraprofessionals. The 58 paraprofessionals were assigned to each teacher for each class period. They assisted in maintaining materials and equipment and keeping records. They engaged in tutorial instruction under the supervision and direction of the teacher.

Facilities. The participating high schools provided for classrooms or other space that were used as reading skills centers. In general the facilities were allocated solely for use as a reading skills center. There were approximately five locations where the facilities were used for other classroom purposes in addition to its use for the TOPS Program.

Supplies and Equipment. The following items were provided for the TOPS Program: 1. Textbooks, workbooks, and kits (for individualized instruction--largely multi-level, high ethnic interest, urban oriented and self-correcting. 2.

Paperbacks for class library (for high interest pleasure reading). 3. Cassette tapes and tape recordings for instruction in phonics and other skills. 4. Cassette-type recorders and headsets. 5. Storage cabinets for equipment and materials. 6. Printing and paper costs for dissemination of information, teacher-made instructional materials, and materials for training sessions. 7. General materials such as Scope Magazine for motivating pupils to read supplementary literature.

CHAPTER II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

This chapter contains: 1. the statement of the evaluation objectives as they appear in the design, 2. the evaluative instruments specified for each evaluation objectives, 3. pertinent dates of the evaluative process, and 4. an explanation of data loss.

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Project, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real posttest score and the predicted posttest score.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Evaluation Instruments for Objective #1: The Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading were the instruments used for Evaluation Objective #1. Forms H and F (Intermediate and Advanced Levels) were used for the prettest. Form G (Intermediate and Advanced Levels) was used for the posttest.

The Historical Regression Method was utilized to analyze the data for Evaluation Objective #1.

Evaluation Instruments for Objective #2: Two instruments for Evaluation Objective #2 were developed by the evaluator. The Program Implementation Checklist included three sections: 1. Activities of Staff, 2. Administrative Period Assignments, 3. Functions of Educational Assistant. The first section contained 12 duties specified in the evaluation design, the second section contained 11 duties as specified, and the third section contained 15 duties as specified.

The Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations was developed by the evaluator for data gathering during his visits to the reading skills centers of the TOPS Program. The criteria items in this form were: 1. Learning environment of the skills center, 2. Quality of class activities, 3. Teacher preparation for the class activities, 4. Teacher's attitude, 5. Student's work, 6. Student's attitudes, 7. Quality of the instructional materials and equipment, 8. Adequacy of Facilities, 9. Utilization of equipment, 10. Individual unit's implementation of TOPS Program objectives, 11. Program strengths, 12. Program weaknesses or problems, and 13. Suggestions.

The rating scale used in the Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations was 5 for excellent, 4 for very good, 3 for good, 2 for fair and 1 for poor.

Dates of Pre and Posttesting. The dates of the Fall Term prettest were from September 25 through October 18, 1974. The dates of the Spring Term prettest were from January 14 through March 24, 1975. The dates of the Fall Term posttest were from January 14 through January 25, 1975 and the dates of the Spring Term posttest were from May 22 through June 3, 1975.

Dates of Visits to Schools. The evaluator completed 30 half-day and 8 full day visits to school sites in conjunction with the TOPS Program from October 31, 1974 through June 3, 1975. The evaluator also attended three of the training sessions provided for the TOPS personnel. In addition, the evaluator presented an interim evaluation report of the TOPS Program at a meeting of reading coordinators, teacher-trainers, and central office personnel in the Spring of 1975.

Data Loss. The loss of data are reported in the appropriate form attached to this report. Data were obtained from 3704 of the 4569 (81.1 per cent) students in the TOPS Program. This represents a data loss of 18.9 per cent. The reasons for the data loss as indicated by the teachers and the numbers in the several categories are: truant, 427; absent, 188; discharged, 178; transferred, 29; dropped, 21, graduated, 9; moved, 5; refused to take test, 3; medical reason, 3; and suspended, 2.

The difficulties with respect to the students not tested are varied, human, personal and complex. The evaluator is satisfied that the teachers diligently attempted to obtain test data from the maximum number of the students actively engaged in the TOPS classes.

CHAPTER III. FINDINGS

This chapter includes: 1. findings in context of the evaluation objectives, 2. adequacies of facilities and materials, 3. statement of discrepancy analysis, 4. servicing the needs of the specific target population, and 5. statement about last prior evaluation recommendations.

Findings in context of evaluation objectives. The findings related to Evaluation Objectives #1 and #2 are reported in this section.

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Project, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the actual posttest score and the predicted posttest score.

Findings of Evaluation Objective #1: As a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Project, (TOPS Program) the mean reading grade of 3704 students in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades, did show a statistically significant difference between the actual posttest and the predicted posttest mean scores at the .01 level. These data are reported in Table 30A which is attached to this report.

It is important to note that 1191 students of the 3704 tested, or 32.1 per cent, participated in the TOPS Program for only one term. This fact, along with the predicted posttest scores of students in the low achievement categories of 2.0 to 5.0, weighted and lower the overall predicted posttest mean scores.

An inspection of the data in Table 30A reveals the following:

1. For the 9th grade, the pretest mean score was 5.27, the predicted posttest mean score was 5.74, and the actual posttest mean score was 5.89. Therefore, the 9th graders achieved a mean growth of 6.2 months and exceeded the predicted score by 1.5 months. Through the statistical analysis of these data the *t* value of 18.45 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level with 1039 degrees of freedom.

2. For the 10th grade, the pretest mean score was 5.81, the predicted posttest mean score was 6.27, and the actual posttest mean score was 6.39. Therefore, the 10th graders achieved a mean growth of 5.8 months and exceeded the predicted posttest mean score by 1.2 months. Through the statistical analysis of these data the *t* value of 11.49 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level with 1394 degrees of freedom.

3. For the 11th grade, the pretest mean score was 5.98, the predicted posttest score was 6.43, and the actual posttest mean score was 6.50. Therefore, the 11th grade students achieved a mean growth of 5.2 months and exceeded the predicted mean score by 0.7 month. Through the statistical analysis of these data the t value of 6.63 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level with 936 degrees of freedom.

4. For the 12th grade, the pretest mean score was 6.27, the predicted posttest score was 6.70, and the actual posttest mean score was 6.99. Therefore, the 12th grade students achieved a mean growth of 7.2 months and exceeded the predicted mean score by 2.9 months. Through the statistical analysis of these data the t value of 6.29 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level with 331 degrees of freedom.

Thus, the "hard data" obtained through the instruments to evaluate Objective #1, indicates that in this important dimension of reading skill development and performance, the students did progress beyond their previous records of achievement and therefore, the TOPS Program did achieve Objective #1.

Evaluation Objective #2: The findings related to Evaluation Objective #2 report the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Findings of Evaluation Objective #2: The evaluation of Evaluation Objective #2 includes data from the Implementation Checklist, the Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations and interviews with many persons involved in the TOPS Program.

This section includes the findings of the extent and quality of implementation of the various personnel functions.

Supervisor. On the basis of the evaluator's total work with the TOPS Program, it is the judgment of the evaluator, that the supervisor ranks at the "99th percentile" in terms of supervision, leadership and administration of the program. He is an outstanding professional educator, with a rare combination of expertise and the concomitant ability to organize and administer a complex, at times controversial, and at all times an important and high priority program. He further has the sterling mixture of softness and toughness in human decision-making. There are many people who are involved in the success of the TOPS Program. This evaluator ascribes the most potent influence and impact to this leader.

Supervisory assistants. They are also very competent and diligent professionals. They work well as a team, know

the technical and specialized aspects of the TOPS Program, provide excellent administrative support, and implement the supervisory and training function to a superior level.

The teacher-trainers. The teacher-trainers are all expert and competent professionals. They carry out the program duties in a serious manner. The teacher-trainers provide the close link between the central office and the schools. While working with teachers in the classroom or in conference they do their work with a high degree of effectiveness. If they see a weakness in a classroom situation, they offer immediate suggestions and assistance. The teacher-trainers also work with the department chairman and principal when the situation requires.

Reading coordinators. In the schools where the TOPS Program is large enough to have reading coordinators, it was observed that they were in the large majority excellent reading teachers. They implement their duties well, work effectively with the English chairman, and most importantly work effectively with the colleague teachers and the educational assistants.

Reading Teachers. The findings through the Implementation Checklist indicate that there is a high degree of congruency between the program design and program implementation with respect to the functions of the teachers. There are 38 activities and phases of the program that were evaluated through the checklist. These activities were carried out consistently in the highest majority of the schools.

In the entire program there was only one high school in which two teachers were assigned to official classes. The problem was rectified within several months.

In the data to be reported in the section about the Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations, it is further noted that "teacher attitudes" and "teacher prepartation" received 4.64 and 4.51 respectively. These mean ratings on a 5 point scale, with 5 signifying an excellent rating, point to the fact that in the overall the TOPS teachers are very superior.

Educational Assistants. The educational assistants are satisfactory. They carry out the duties as outlined in the Program Proposal.

Findings of Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations. Ten elements obtained from the evaluation form are reported in Table 1, page 10.

Teacher Attitudes toward TOPS ranked first with a 4.64 rating. Positive teacher attitudes indicated an understanding of the importance of the TOPS Program.

Learning Environment ranked second with a rating of 4.52. Minimal disciplinary problems, good self-direction, and maximal learning time are an integral characteristic of the class operation.

Teacher Preparation for Class ranked third with a rating of 4.51. Good organization and planning, establishment of routines, and constant checking and feedback of students' work was commonly observed.

Educational Assistants Performance ranked fourth with a rating of 4.50. They perform their duties, are enthusiastic about the work, and provide supplementary tutorial assistance for the students.

Quality of Class Activities ranked fifth with a rating of 4.47. Class activities emphasize an individualized diagnostic and prescriptive approach. A wide variety of materials and activities are commonly observed.

Quality of Instructional Materials ranked sixth with a rating of 4.46. The instructional materials are rich in variety, multi-levels, high ethnic interest, high urban focus, and appropriate length.

Implementation of Program Objectives ranked seventh with a rating of 4.41. Through constant checking students could see incremental growth in the various reading skills.

Student's Attitudes ranked eighth with a rating of 4.15. The vast majority of the students observed in the TOPS classes had positive attitudes. They entered the classroom, went to the file and pulled their folder, noted their work for the day, got their materials, went to work, at times conferred with the teacher or educational assistant, finished the work, checked the work, logged the results, returned the folders--thereby completing a "good class job."

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF ELEMENTS IN TOPS CLASSES

N=72

Elements	Rank	Mean Rating*
Teacher Attitudes toward TOPS	1	4.64
Learning Environment	2	4.52
Teacher Preparation for Class	3	4.51
Educational Assistant Performance	4	4.50
Quality of Class Activities	5	4.47
Quality of Instructional Materials	6	4.46
Implementation of Program Objectives	7	4.41
Student's Attitudes	8	4.15
Student's Work	9	4.05
Facilities	10	4.01

*Rating scale value: 5 for excellent, 4 for very good, 3 for good, 2 for fair and 1 for poor.

Student's Work ranked ninth with a rating of 4.05. The TOPS Program is task oriented. About 1/4 of the students did a great amount of work, about 1/2 of the students completed a good amount of work, and about 1/4 of the students completed an adequate or fair amount of work.

Facilities were ranked tenth with a rating of 4.01. About 1/4 of the facilities were rated as exceptional in terms of space, lighting and ambience. Most of the facilities were very good and about five were considered too small.

In conclusion, the overall rating of the elements reported in Table 1, was very favorable regarding the students, the faculty and educational assistants, the materials, the class format, and the facilities.

Statement of Discrepancy Analysis. Other than one situation which was rectified within a short period, the TOPS Program was implemented according to the guidelines of the Project Proposal.

Servicing the Needs of the Specific Target Population. The TOPS Program did service the needs of the specific target population. These were Title 1 Optional Assignment students in grades 9-12, whose reading ability was a minimum of two years below grade level based on the Metropolitan Reading Tests.

Statement about Last Prior Evaluation Recommendations. In the last prior evaluation, two recommendations were cited in the current Project Proposal: First, provide for detection of visual or auditory problems. The response to this recommendation was that the Health Education Department would be asked to cooperate in giving appropriate tests. Because of budget problems, this recommendation received the regular type of assistance through the normal referral process.

The second recommendation was to integrate reading skills development with subject area curriculum. The most formal response to this recommendation was that most of the reading coordinators were invited to speak on the topic of "integrating reading skills development with subject area curriculum." In addition, most of the TOPS teachers initiated informal meetings with various subject teachers in order to help students develop needed vocabulary and appropriate reading skills.

Reading Institutes and Conferences. TOPS Program personnel were invited to attend and participate in the several Reading Institutes and Conferences that were organized through the Office of the Title I High School Reading Programs. These training sessions provided excellent assistance for the newer personnel. They also served as a forum for new ideas in the field of reading.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes: 1. the summary of major findings, 2. conclusions, 3. recommendations, and 4. statement of program continuation.

Summary of the major findings. The major findings of this evaluation are:

1. The students in the TOPS Program did progress beyond their previous record of achievement in reading skills development. Therefore, the TOPS Program did achieve Evaluation Objective #1.

2. The TOPS Program implementation coincided to a very high extent with the program as described in the Project Proposal. Specifically, the following factors served to maximize the effectiveness and success of the program:

2.1 TOPS had the benefit of superior leadership and management.

2.2 Competent teacher-trainers provided effective assistance.

2.3 The instructional team, which included the reading coordinators, reading teachers, educational assistants, the teacher-trainers, and often the English chairman, collaborated in a highly productive manner.

2.4 A majority of the students were highly motivated, only a few caused disciplinary problems, and many worked hard in the TOPS Program to improve their reading skills.

2.5 The reading skills lab format, which was organized to provide individualized, small class, and diagnostic and prescriptive instruction was an important factor in the success of the TOPS Program.

2.6 The abundant instructional materials and equipment were instrumental in making the TOPS Program a learning center which was both interesting and attractive for the students.

2.7 The TOPS Program classroom facilities in general were very satisfactory.

2.8. One of the problems of the TOPS Program was the truancy of about 10 to 15 per cent of the students assigned to the program. These students did not want, or possibly did not understand the value of the program, or possibly would benefit from the program. The reasons for the truancy behavior are diverse and complex and mainly outside the context of the program.

Conclusions: The major conclusions of this evaluation are:

1. The TOPS Program is designed as a success experience for students. The program is provided in a non-threatening manner. The TOPS Program is an excellent model which indicates that many of the students, who have had a long history of academic failure, may be reached. It is apparent that a sizeable number of students did participate and benefit through the program. Therefore, TOPS is a "success program."

2. The effective central office organization, supervision and management are conducive to the high level of implementation of the program according to the guidelines of the Project Proposal.

3. The instructional team approach is an excellent way to make rapid progress in a relatively new area of the curriculum in the high school.

4. The reading skills lab operates in such a way that the students are active learners rather than listening to someone else lecture. Since the TOPS Program was organized as a small class unit, it was possible for the teachers and the educational assistants to provide frequent one-to-one instruction. It is apparent that as the students began to understand the routines for self-direction, they were able to maximize the amount of time they spend on reading developmental skills mastery.

5. The Reading Institutes and Training Conferences served as an excellent means of training new TOPS personnel, of up-grading teachers, and exchanging new ideas.

6. The TOPS Program benefitted because of various factors. It had abundant and solid instructional materials and very satisfactory facilities. However, the most important components were the human resources, who encouraged and motivated and taught the students so that they could achieve the progress they did in an important area of reading skills development.

7. For years, educators have extolled the virtues of individualized, diagnostic and prescriptive instruction. This type of instructional organization is still in its earlier stages of development. Nevertheless, the TOPS Program has implemented this instructional mode and the results have been positive.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are offered:

1. Retain the present emphasis on the small class, individualized, and diagnostic format of the TOPS Program.

2. Continue to emphasize the success model and the non-threatening approach for these students who have had abundant experiences of failure in their previous academic life.

3. Continue the instructional team approach which includes the teacher-trainers, reading coordinators, reading teachers, educational assistants and department chairman.

3. Continue the in-service training program which provides new information and concepts in the field of remedial reading in the high schools.

4. Continue to purchase instructional materials that will expand the motivational interests of the students.

5. Budget some funds which will permit the replenishing of keys, answer sheets, and other expendable and usable materials.

6. Persuade the principals in the high schools where the facilities are crowded to provide more satisfactory rooms.

7. Retain, if possible, the leadership of the present supervisor of the program.

Statement of Program Continuation. Continue and if possible expand the TOPS Program because its purpose is critical and its benefits are important for the students that it serves. The present organization of the TOP Program is an excellent approach to provide a dynamic educational program for servicing the needs of the target population.

CHAPTER V: EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The Skills Remediation in Reading for Optional Assignment Program, (commonly referred to as TOPS) was conducted for 4569 students in 27 high schools from September 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975.

The component codes for the TOPS Program were 60815 and 60816.

Evaluation Objective #1 was to determine whether, as a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Project, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real posttest score and the predicted posttest score. The evaluation instruments for Objective #1 were the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading, Forms H, F, and G at the Intermediate or Advanced Levels.

Evaluation Objective #2 was to determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal. The evaluation instruments for Objective 2 were the Implementation Checklist and the Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations.

The thrust of the program was that of individualized instruction using diagnostic prescriptive techniques in the reading skills lab. Since the class size was limited to 15 students, they received optimum attention and instruction based on the analysis of their strengths and weaknesses in reading.

Data were obtained from 3704 of the 4569 (81.1 per cent) students in the TOPS Program.

The major findings were:

The students in the TOPS Program did progress beyond their previous record of achievement in reading skills development.

The TOPS Program implementation coincided to a very high extent with the program as described in the Project Proposal. Specifically, the following factors served to maximize the effectiveness of the program: 1. TOPS had the benefit of superior leadership, 2. Competent teacher-trainers provided effective assistance. 3. The instructional team, which included the reading coordinators, reading teachers, educational assistants, the teacher-trainers, and often the English chairman, collaborated in a highly productive manner. 4. The reading skills lab format and the abundant materials, and the small class size facilitated an individualized, diagnostic and prescriptive organization which was very effective in achieving the objective of the program.

Use Table 30A. for Historical Regression Design (6-Step Formula) for Reading (English); Math (English); Reading (Non-English); Math (Non-English).

30A. Standardized Test Results.

In the Table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6 step formula (see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, p. 45-49). Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

[49]

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used[1]	Form		Level		Total N[2]	Group I.D.[3]	Number Tested[4]	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean	Obtained Value of t	Level[5] of significance
60815	7207	MAT	H	G	I	I	1284	9th	1040	10/74 2/75	5.27	5.74	1/75 5/75	5.89	18.45	p≤.01
60816	7207	MAT	H	G	A	A	1754	10th	1395	"	5.81	6.27	"	6.39	11.49	p≤.01
60816	7207	MAT	F	G	A	A	1152	11th	937	"	5.98	6.43	"	6.50	6.63	p≤.01
60816	7207	MAT	F	G	A	A	379	12th	332	"	6.27	6.70	"	6.99	6.29	p≤.01

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
5/ Specify level of statistical significance obtained (e.g., $p \leq .05$; $p \leq .01$).

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09-59677

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
06 08 15	720	9th	MAT	1284	1040	244	19.0	Truant	427
								Absent	188
06 08 16	720	10th	MAT	1754	1395	359	20.5	Discharged	178
								Transferred	29
06 08 16	720	11th	MAT	1152	937	215	18.6	Dropped	21
								Moved	5
06 08 16	720	12th	MAT	379	332	47	12.4	Graduated	9
								Refused to take test	3
								Medical	3
								Suspended	2

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.